

REMARKS

Applicants have requested and the Examiner has agreed to issue a supplemental office action. Applicants submit this response to ensure extension of time fees are avoided and to formally respond to the Office Action dated November 26, 2009.

I. Statement of Substance of Interviews

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Hurst and SPE Warden for the series of interviews conducted at the end of January and the beginning of February, 2009. During the initial interview, Examiner Hurst stated that he would not examine each of the alternatives of the multiple dependent claims. Noting MPEP 608.01(n)I.F., Applicants' undersigned representative requested that the Examiner issue a new, complete office action that properly considered the multiple dependent claims.

It was agreed that Examiner Hurst would issue a Supplemental Office Action. Examiner Hurst stated that he would do so when he obtained a translation of the Durst reference (DE4308697). Examiner Hurst also agreed that the next office action would be non-final.

II. The "Allowable Subject Matter"

Since the Examiner admits that he has not rejected claims 4/3/2, 5/3/2, 6/3/2, 13/12/11 and 14/12/11, Applicants consider those claims to be allowable.

III. The Art Rejections

Claims 1-3, 7, 10-11 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Anderson et al. (US 2002/0015952).

Claims 8-9 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Anderson as applied to claims 1-3, 7, 10-11 and 14 above, and further in view of Wolk (US

6,148,508).

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (US2002/0015952) as applied to claims 1-3, 7, 10-11 and 14 above, and further in view of Matson et al. (US 5,429,807).

Claims 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Frazier et al. (WO 00/16833).

Claims 2, 4, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Durst et al. (DE4308697).

Applicants respectfully submit that each of Applicants' claimed embodiments is not contained in the cited art.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that their claimed invention is allowable and ask that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 be reconsidered and withdrawn. Applicants respectfully submit that this case is in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully solicited.

If any points remain at issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the local exchange number listed below.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/LEE C. WRIGHT/

Lee C. Wright
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,441
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

LCW/af